

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that this correspondence along with other possible documents has been electronically transmitted to the USPTO through its own EFS filing system on May 10, 2010.

Typed Name: Kevin D. McCarthy  
Date: May 10, 2010

0-05-106 - 15524/US/02

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Inventor: Joshi et al.  
Serial no.: 10/541,011  
I.A. Filed: December 29, 2003  
Title: ENHANCED GENERATION OF HYDROXYL RADICALS  
Examiner: Edna Wong  
Art Unit: 1795  
Confirmation: 9060

DO NOT ENTER: /EW/

05/12/2010

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir/Madam:

**After-Final Response and Amendment**

This response is in reply to the final office action mailed on March 10, 2010.

**Amendments**

1. Please amend claim 1, cancel claims 4 and 6, and add new claims 19 and 20 as shown on the marked-up amended pages.

The formal error at line 3 of claim 1 has been corrected, the plural form in the word "mixtures" has been corrected to singular, addressing the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. For the record, the letter "s" in "mixtures" was struckthrough in the last response.

The description of step i) in claim 1 has been amended to specify said supplying oxygen to the mixture, restricting claim 1 to a preferred embodiment originally covered in claim 4 – now canceled. The description of step ii) in claim 1 has been amended to add inadvertently missing preposition "at". The description of step iv) in claim 1 has been amended to specify the wavelength of said UV light, restricting claim 1 to a preferred embodiment originally covered in claim 6 – now canceled. Finally, the description of method for quantifying the generated radicals has been deleted from claim 1, as not being essential for the definition of the claimed process, and it was incorporated into new claim 19 (comprising, in fact, the subject matter of original claims 17-18, previously canceled).

New claim 20, relating to a preferred use of the claimed method, has been added, supported in the paragraph which bridges pages 5 and 6 of the specification.

These amendments do not require further searching since these limitations were previously presented and the examiner previously examined those limitations. In addition, no new matter has been entered.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112**

2. Claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's rejections, which rejection is now believed to be moot.